

**Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)**  
**April 15, 2004 Meeting Minutes**

---

**1. Roll Call**

Members present: Robbie Webber, Bob Dye, Rose Phetteplace, Al Matano, Eileen Bruskevitz, Lisa MacKinnon, Kris Euclide, John Volker, Ken Golden, Dave Phillips  
Staff present: Bob McDonald, Bill Schaefer, Deb DeDecker, Bob Pike

**2. Approval of February 4, 2004 Meeting Minutes**

Moved by Phillips, seconded by Webber, to approve February 4, 2004 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

**3. Communications**

- Letter from Frank J. Busalacchi, WisDOT Secretary to McDonald, reappointing Phetteplace as WisDOT's representative to the Madison Area MPO.
- Letter from Ray Fisher, Madison City Clerk, copied to McDonald, revoking David Hart's appointment to the Madison Area MPO because of his failure to file the Statement of Interests required by Madison General Ordinances 3.47.
- Letter from Busalacchi, copied to McDonald, approving Amendment #2 to the 2004-2008 Transportation Improvement Program, and including it in their 2004-2006 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
- Memo from Kathleen M. Falk, Dane Co. Executive, to local leaders, copied to McDonald, suggesting a meeting to discuss ways to collaborate on a long-term regional land use and transportation vision for the Northeast region of the county.

**4. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)**

None

**5. Consideration of Press Release and Citizen Participation Effort and Generalized Schedule for Preparing the 2005-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Area**

McDonald stated that these documents follow the same format and general schedule approved by the MPO Board last year. Moved by Phillips, seconded by Webber, to approve the press release and citizen participation effort and generalized schedule for preparing the 2005-2009 Transportation Improvement Program for the Dane County Area. Motion carried.

**6. Consideration of Letter of Transmittal Requesting Projects for STP-Urban Funding and TIP Update**

McDonald introduced the item, which requests projects from local units of government for STP-Urban funding and inclusion in the TIP. The request for projects is in accord with federal and state rules. Webber suggested that language be added to the letter stating that bicycle and pedestrian accommodations should be considered as part of street and roadway projects. McDonald said he would do that. Moved by Bruskevitz, seconded by Volker, to approve release of the letter requesting projects for STP-Urban funding and for inclusion in the TIP with the suggested editing change. Motion carried.

**7. Consideration of Appointment to the USH-51 (I39/90 to McFarland) Phase II Corridor Study Policy Advisory Committee**

Dye volunteered for the appointment and the board supported his nomination.

**8. Announcements and Schedule of Future Work Items**

- Presentation of Draft TDP Recommendations
- Regional Transportation Plan Update: Background Report of Trends and Issues

Golden adjourned Madison Area MPO Meeting at 6:16 p.m.

**Joint Meeting of the Madison Area MPO and the  
Dane Co. Regional Planning Commission**

**9. Roll Call and Introductions**

MPO Members present: Bruskewitz, Dye, Euclide, MacKinnon, Matano, Phetteplace, Phillips, Volker, Webber, Golden, MacKinnon  
RPC Members present: Christenson, Clauder, Cornwell, Eisman, Hamre, Golden, Kasieta, Krantz, MacKinnon, Miller, Olson, Rattmann, Vanden Brook  
Others present: MPO staff DeDecker, McDonald, Pike, Schaefer; RPC Staff Chris Gjestson, Michael King, Bill Preboski; Attorney Lehmann; Todd Violante, Dane Co. Planning; Jon Schellpfeffer, MMSD

**10. Presentation on Dane Co. Growth and Transportation Trends by Michael King, Executive Director of the Dane Co. RPC and Bob McDonald, Transportation Planning Manager of the Madison Area MPO**

Mr. King provided a PowerPoint presentation on Dane County growth trends, including forecast population, school age population, labor force, and retirement age population. He discussed housing forecasts, sizes, needs and densities, and the forecasted amount of land required for development. He then discussed the difference between RPC population and development forecasts and those of local adopted plans, and compared growth trends of urban and rural areas of the county.

Mr. McDonald provided a PowerPoint presentation on the authority and responsibilities of the Madison Area MPO, and on transportation trends in the Madison metropolitan planning area. He showed a map of the Madison urban area and MPO planning area boundaries. The MPO has authority over federally funded transportation projects in the planning area. Only those projects within the urban area are eligible for STP-Urban funds--a direct funding allocation to the MPO. He discussed the requirements and relevance of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP is a coordinated listing of all federally funded projects and is updated every year. The TIP implements the RTP, which is currently the *Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan*. It is federally required that the RTP be updated every 5 years, and the plan was last reaffirmed in 2000. The next update of the plan must be completed by the end of 2005. McDonald briefly described several corridor and sub-area studies that the MPO is participating in or has undertaken. He then discussed regional transportation trends, providing information on workplace commuting, public transit ridership, bicycle work trips to downtown Madison, and roadway congestion.

Royce Williams, 2437 Fox Ave., Madison, representing himself, registered to speak. Mr. Williams stated that it was important for the boundaries of the MPO planning area and the Central Urban Service Area (CUSA) to be the same. He said the maps produced by the Dane County Department of Planning and Development (DCDPD) for the comprehensive plan did not show the CUSA or MPO boundaries and he felt it was important that they do.

**11. Discussion of Implications and Questions Related to the Roles of the Dane County RPC (or Successor Agency) and the Madison Area MPO in Any Updates to the Dane Co. Land Use and Transportation Plan**

Mr. McDonald stated that in the past the population, household, and employment allocations that are used to develop the travel forecasts for the transportation plan have been based on the urban service area growth forecasts of the RPC. Given that the MPO is required to update its RTP every 5 years, he asked who would be responsible for making future sub-area forecasts if the RPC goes out of existence.

Mr. Golden stated that the MPO did not itself have the authority to create a land use plan. It needed to base its transportation plan on adopted land use plan(s), but the current regional land use plan is out of date. Ms. Bruskewitz stated that an ideal option would be a multi-county agency that could address both intra- and inter-county land use and transportation planning issues. She said some of these issues could be worked out through the county comprehensive plan. Mr. McDonald pointed out that the county only has jurisdiction in the rural areas. He stated that without an updated county land use plan, the MPO would have to rely on local adopted land use plans. He pointed out the difficulties of using local land use plans to prepare the transportation plan, because of the conflicts between some of the plans and the need for a control total for population countywide based upon

the 2030 planning horizon for the transportation plan. Referring to a map showing planned growth areas of local plans, he said the plans provide for almost 50% more population growth than forecasted for the county by 2030, and several municipalities, including the City of Madison, have not finished their plans. He said it would be ideal if the MPO had guidance from the RPC on sub-allocating the state's population forecast for the county to urban service areas. The MPO could then distribute the urban service area population forecasts to its traffic analysis zones using local adopted land use plans.

Mr. Golden stated that the RPC currently advises the MPO on sub-area population forecasts, and asked what agency would serve that role after October 1, considering no other agency or proposed agency had that authority. He then asked RPC Commissioners what advice they wanted to give the MPO regarding what it should do after the RPC dissolves. Mr. Clauder expressed concern about which agency would provide advice to the MPO after October 1. Mr. Golden discussed the contentious issue of allocating population to different communities, and suggested that the RPC could adopt a resolution with revised forecasts for the MPO to use. This would provide the MPO with more guidance for using the forecasts as the basis for the transportation plan.

Mr. Volker stated that the suggested approach would solve the problem only for the 2005 transportation plan. He said there was a need to put in place a mechanism to provide forecasts and coordinate land use planning for future transportation plans. Mr. Golden agreed, but expressed confidence that some entity would be created to carry on a regional approach to planning in the future. In the meantime, the MPO had to adopt an updated RTP by the end of 2005, and a new planning body would not be in place in time to advise the MPO.

Mr. Eisman stated that there were other issues not related to transportation that would no longer be addressed after the RPC is dissolved, such as open space and sewer service and wastewater facilities planning. He said WisDNR does not want to take over the water quality planning responsibilities. He felt that the pressures on local units of government, the county, and the state from the absence of an RPC would provide the impetus for the creation of a future regional planning agency.

Ms. Euclide also thought that a regional agency would be created in the future, which would ideally be multi-county in nature, but this did not address the current needs of the MPO. She stated that there were other MPOs that did not have a comprehensive plan on which to base their transportation plans, and she believed that the Madison Area MPO had the authority to integrate transportation and land use planning, taking into consideration economic development, demographics, environmental protection, growth management, and consistency with local plans. She felt that regardless of the political nature of this approach, it might be necessary due to the lack of options. Mr. Volker stated that engaging in land use planning could create a negative perception of the MPO, similar to that of the current RPC, because the non-elected members were not sufficiently accountable. Ms. MacKinnon referred to Ms. Euclide's comments, and suggested that the Federal MPO planning rules did not allow for the creation of new land use policy, but did allow MPOs to refer to existing local policies. She stated that local plan consistency had been central in discussions of the criteria for urban service area amendments for the proposed Council of Governments. Ms. Euclide stated that it might be up to the MPO to address the inconsistencies of all the local plans as these relate to transportation planning.

Ms. Bruskewitz asked about the inconsistencies between population forecasts of local plans and the RPC forecasts. Mr. King stated that he and Mr. McDonald were discussing a potential meeting with local planners and administrators, perhaps on May 21, to discuss these inconsistencies. Ms. Bruskewitz suggested that the Dane County Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee be involved in that meeting. Mr. Hamre suggested that the RPC make a recommendation to the MPO on how it should address population forecasts and land use in its RTP update.

Ms. Euclide stated that while there were good local plans, there was sometimes a lack of coordination of those plans and cooperation between communities. She referred to the difficulty of planning locally while understanding the regional impacts. She referred to North Mendota Parkway project as an example of a successful intergovernmental planning effort. The five communities had successfully worked out the inconsistencies between their plans and addressed the inter-relationship of their land use plans and the proposed

transportation improvements. She stated that the MPO plan has to recognize local plans, but that communities also need to see how their plans affect transportation facilities when they are developing them. Ms. Olson stated that part of the reason for the success of the North Mendota Parkway project was the effectiveness of the facilitator and staff.

Mr. Golden summarized the members' comments. The two bodies had a deep respect for local plans. The RPC could utilize those plans to provide constructive advice to the MPO on how to address these plans and their collective inconsistencies and problems. Local governments should work out some of these inconsistencies in their plans in an intergovernmental process. Prior to its dissolution, the RPC could refer to the county's comprehensive plan for advice and adopt a resolution to give MPO advice on how to address its immediate needs in developing the transportation plan.

Mr. Violante stated that it was important to remember that the county's comprehensive plan would only cover the unincorporated areas of the county. He suggested that the value of the RPC was in its intergovernmental role in coordinating planning in towns and incorporated areas, fully integrated with transportation planning. He stated that the challenge was for the MPO, RPC and the county planning department to work together cohesively in a comprehensive approach to planning. Mr. Schellpfeffer stated that there was a statutory tie between the RPC and Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD). He stated that MMSD cannot implement any plan that is not in compliance with the adopted plans of the RPC. MMSD relied on the RPC for guidance with reviews of sewer extension requests, judgments on plan consistency, location of environmental corridors, and coordination of stormwater plans. MMSD was currently talking with DNR about how they will respond to communities' requests for sewer service upon annexation of territories to the MMSD after dissolution of the RPC. He expressed concern over the current lack of direction.

Ms. Bruskevitz stated that although the county only had jurisdiction in the unincorporated areas, an important aspect of its comprehensive plan was its emphasis on intergovernmental agreements, regardless of the type of municipality. She suggested that this approach was conducive to cooperation, but there was currently no forum to support this approach. Mr. McDonald described an intergovernmental effort to address plan inconsistencies between various municipalities in the northeastern part of the county, but stated that such an effort was not being conducted systematically on a countywide basis.

Mr. Golden recommended that each body should have on their next agenda an item for discussion regarding implementation of the issues and ideas discussed at this meeting, and exchange updates of its discussions and on what each body is doing.

Mr. Eisman stated that the RPC had agreed as a body not to lobby for its own survival. He suggested that the MPO not be constrained as such and should voice its concerns over the future absence of a regional land use planning agency. Mr. Golden stated that the MPO would discuss it at their next meeting.

## **12. Adjournment**

Golden adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.